

**PUBLIC COPY**

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: WAC-02-053-58621

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 08 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a nursing registry with 150 employees and a gross annual income of \$4 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a recruitment director for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation or that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides, in part, for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that a baccalaureate degree is required for the proffered position, or that the beneficiary meets the petitioner's own criterion to qualify for the proffered position. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the Department of Labor (DOL) in its *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (*Handbook*) finds that employers usually require college graduates for its human resources specialist and manager positions. Counsel further states that information from California's Employment Development Department, as well as a letter from another nurse provider and Internet job advertisements support the finding of the DOL in its *Handbook*.

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The AAO does not use a title, by itself, when determining whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the AAO considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Her main responsibility will be to seek out, interview, screen, and recruit qualified nurses. She will initially discuss with the undersigned and all human resources directors of our client hospitals their requirements. . . .

She will contact different colleges (Nursing) to arrange on campus interviews and possible internship programs with top graduates. She will conduct seminars and workshops to discuss company objectives and job opportunities available and[,] at the same time, obtain work history, education, training, job skills and salary requirements of the new graduates. She will also conduct screening tests to [sic] all applicants to determine not only their nursing skills but also their English proficiency. She will check references and conduct background investigations, if necessary.

She will also conduct meetings with college deans and professors to discuss training and possible employment of its new graduates. . . .

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

1. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
2. The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
3. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or

4. The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to classify the offered position as a specialty occupation.

First, the AAO does not agree with counsel's assertion that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in nursing or a related field. The proffered position is that of a recruitment director/specialist. A review of the DOL's *Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, at pages 62-63, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment as an employment, recruitment, and placement specialist. Employers usually seek college graduates from a variety of educational backgrounds in filling entry-level jobs. Many employers prefer applicants who have majored in human resources, personnel administration, or industrial and labor relations. Other employers prefer college graduates with a technical or business background or a well-rounded liberal arts education. It is noted that the information submitted from California's Employment Development Department on "Human Resources Specialists and Managers" supports the DOL's finding. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, the petitioner has not demonstrated that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specific specialty such as nursing, for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is common to the industry in parallel positions among organizations similar to the petitioner. The Internet job advertisements are noted. The petitioner, however, has not persuasively demonstrated that the duties of the proffered position are as complex as those listed for the advertised positions. For example, one of the positions is that of a healthcare recruiter for Kaiser Permanente, whose duties include providing comprehensive consulting and staffing services for one of the largest not-for-profit healthcare organizations in the U.S., serving 8.1 million members. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The record also contains a letter from the president of another healthcare provider, who states, in part, that she normally requires at least a bachelor's degree for positions similar to the proffered position. She has not, however, submitted any evidence in support of her assertion. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

As the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation, the beneficiary's qualifications need not be examined further in this proceeding.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.